

EXHIBIT 1

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

HARRIET LOWELL and WESTCHESTER
DISABLED ON THE MOVE, INC.,
individually and on behalf of all others similarly
situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

LYFT, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 7:17-cv-06251-PMH-AEK

**PLAINTIFF HARRIET LOWELL'S
THIRD AMENDED OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO
DEFENDANT LYFT, INC.'s SECOND SET OF INTERROGATORIES**

Plaintiff Harriet Lowell ("Plaintiff"), by and through her undersigned attorneys, hereby serves the following Amended Objections and Responses to Defendant Lyft, Inc.'s ("Defendant" or "Lyft") Second Set of Interrogatories.

Dated: July 16, 2021

Respectfully submitted,

**FINKELSTEIN, BLANKINSHIP,
FREI-PEARSON & GARBER, LLP**

s/ Jeremiah Frei-Pearson

Jeremiah Frei-Pearson

Chantal Khalil

One North Broadway, Suite 900

White Plains, New York 10601

Telephone: (914) 298-3281

Facsimile: (914) 824-15610

jfrei-pearson@fbfglaw.com

ckhalil@fbfglaw.com

Shari Puckett	Kankakee, IL
Shawn Rose	Streamwood, IL
Shelley Walenga	Hoffman Estates, IL
Stephanie Elizabeth Ban	Bartlett, IL
Steve Pressley	Schaumburg, IL
Tammy Dimery	Prophetsown, IL
Teresa Grzeslo	Lake Villa, IL
Teresa Szawlowski	Lake Zurich, IL
Theodore Daffin	Chicago, IL
Theresa M Eberhardt	Yorkville, Illinois
Tina Crogham	O'Fallon, MO
Trisa Harris	New York, NY
Valerie Kowalewski	Addison, IL
Valia Perez	Elgin, IL

INTERROGATORY NO. 20:

Identify all individuals whose testimony You intend to offer in support of class certification.

RESPONSE: Plaintiff objects to this interrogatory as premature as discovery is ongoing and Plaintiff is not in a position to determine all witnesses. Plaintiff will identify all witnesses following appropriate discovery and at the time required by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Southern District of New York Local Rules, and the scheduling orders of the Court. Plaintiff also objects to this interrogatory to the extent that the interrogatory and its subparts constitute more interrogatories than are permissible. Plaintiff reserves the right to supplement this response.

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE: Plaintiff reiterates its objection that this interrogatory is premature. Plaintiff also reserves the right to supplement this response. Subject thereto, Plaintiff intends to rely on the following:

Name	
Alex Elegudin	Wheeling Forward. Mr. Elegudin may be contacted through counsel.
Altaira Hatton	Boulder Creek, CA
Amanda Lewis	Chicago, IL
Angel Destiny Rose	Streamwood, IL
Anna Price	Kewana, IN
Annette Hunter-Grey	Chicago, IL

Ansel Lurio	Self-employed. Mr. Lurio may be contacted through counsel.
Ashlee Swanson	Eau Claire
Benjamin Stephens	Chicago, IL
Bruce Carmona	Elk Road Village, IL
Carolina Morello	Waukugen, IL
Carrie Sandahl	Oak Park, IL
Christie Leigh Cellman	Iowa City, Johnson, Iowa
Christine Bousum	Kokomo, IN
Claudia Stern	Hemming Morse Forensic & Financial Consultants. Ms. Stern may be contacted through counsel.
Coreeta Rodriguez	Fort Worth TX
Dann Iswonger	Cape Girardeau
David Yest	Elmwood Park, IL
Debbie McMahan	Montgomery County, TX
Deloris Sarpey	Oak Park, IL
Denise Horn	Janesville, WI
Earl Eggert	Rockford, IL
Eddie Long	Plainfield, IL
Estela Tapia	Chicago, IL
Fallon Marie Hughes	Yonkers/Westchester, NY
Gary Kenney	Rockford, IL
Graciela Luisa Bretschneider	New York, NY (Manhattan)
Harold Lewis	Palatine, IL
Harriet Lowell	Ms. Lowell may be contacted through counsel.
Helen Lee	Schaumburg, IL
Jean Kucen	Lyons, IL
Jeffrey Metz	Portage, IN
Jennie Martinico	Staten Island/Richmond/NY
Jennifer Campos	Havana, IL
Jennifer Gasner	San Diego, CA
Jennifer M Kucera	Berea, Ohio
Jesse Taylor	Chicago, IL
Jessica Hetzel	Macomb, Michigan
Joe Stachurski	Saint Child's IL
John Moynihan	Yonkers, NY
Jose Hernandez	Bronx, NY
Judith Pedi	Bronx, NY
Judith Stalnaker	Chicago, IL
Julie S. Betzel	New Hope, MN
Kale Goffman	Poplar Grove, IL
Kathleen Downes	Floral Park, NY

Kathy Cornell	Arlington Heights, IL
Kathy Dykstra	Monroe, Michigan
Keith Stone	Kalamazoo, Michigan
Kristyn Smith	Schaumburg, IL
Kurt Clifton	Sycamore, IL
Laura C. Berendson	Arlington Heights/Cook, IL
Laura Kurek	Darien, IL
Laura Soto	Evanston, IL
Leilani Logan	Pingree Grove, IL
Lisa Rivera	Bronx, NY
Lisa Schott	Orland Park/Cook, IL
Lois Ray	Chicago, IL
Lucy Marie Richardson	NYC
Maria Lanenga	Sauk Village, IL
Maria Peele	Chicago, IL
Marilyn Maize	Schaumburg, IL
Martin Maude	Paletine, IL
Mary Ann Brown	Janesville, WI
Mary Delgado	Chicago, IL
Mary Querio	Naples, FL
Maryia Svanko	Chicago, IL
Mel Tanzman	Former Executive Director of WDOMI. Mr. Tanzman may be contacted through counsel.
Melinda Diu	Aurora, IL
Monica Barth	Batavia, IL
Norah Perez	Lomboard, IL
Pat Weber	Waukegan, IL
Richard Reece	Cyrstal Lake, IL
Robert Patridge	Altamonte Springs, FL
Sandra Ruth Pinkerton	Fort Lee, NJ
Shari Puckett	Kankakee, IL
Shawn Rose	Streamwood, IL
Shelley Walenga	Hoffman Estates, IL
Stephanie Elizabeth Ban	Bartlett, IL
Steve Pressley	Schaumburg, IL
Tammy Dimery	Prophetsown, IL
Teresa Grzeslo	Lake Villa, IL
Teresa Szawlowski	Lake Zurich, IL
Theodore Daffin	Chicago, IL
Theresa M Eberhardt	Yorkville, Illinois
Tina Crogham	O'Fallon, MO
Trisa Harris	New York, NY
Valerie Kowalewski	Addison, IL

Valia Perez

Elgin, IL

INTERROGATORY NO. 21:

What factors do You contend should be used to determine whether Lyft is providing “full and equal service to disabled individuals who require wheelchair-accessible vehicles” on its platform?

RESPONSE: This Interrogatory requires Plaintiff to apply facts to relevant law regarding Lyft’s obligations to provide services to people with disabilities. Plaintiff objects to this contention interrogatory as premature and in violation of S.D.N.Y. L. Civ. R. 33.3(c). *In re Facebook, Inc.*, MDL No. 12-2389, 2016 WL 5080152, at *2 (S.D.N.Y. July 7, 2016) (holding that interrogatories “ask[ing] Plaintiffs to apply their opinion of the application of relevant law” constitute contention interrogatories). Contention interrogatories must be reserved until after the completion of other discovery. *Id.* at *3 (“Notwithstanding the power to order otherwise, Southern District courts have been generally consistent that the proper understanding of Rule 33 requires contention interrogatories be reserved until after the completion of discovery.”) (collecting cases). The Parties are currently undergoing discovery. Plaintiff also objects to this interrogatory to the extent that the interrogatory and its subparts constitute more interrogatories than are permissible. Plaintiff reserves the right to supplement this interrogatory response upon completion of discovery.

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE: Subject to Plaintiff’s objections (as articulated above), and reserving the right to supplement these interrogatory responses following the completion of discovery, Plaintiff responds as follows:

Metrics that may be used to determine whether Lyft is providing “full and equal service to [individuals with disabilities] who require wheelchair-accessible vehicles” on its platform may include: ease of users’ ability to request wheelchair-accessible vehicles; ride fares; wait times for on-demand ride requests; and on-demand ride acceptance rates.

The ADA Title III Technical Assistance Manual § 4.4700 defines “equivalent service” as follows: “A system is deemed to provide equivalent service if, when the system is viewed in its entirety, the service provided to individuals with disabilities, including those who use wheelchairs, is provided in the most integrated setting appropriate to the needs of the individual and is equivalent to the service provided other individuals. The Department of Transportation regulation lists eight service characteristics that must be equivalent. These include schedules/response time, fares, and places and times of service availability.”

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on July 16, 2021, I caused a true and correct copy of Plaintiff Lowell's Third Amended Objections and Responses to Defendant Lyft, Inc.'s Second Set of Interrogatories to be served by email upon the following:

Jiyun Cameron Lee
Marie Elizabeth Jonas
FOLGER LEVIN LLP
199 Fremont Street, 20th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105
T: (415) 625-1050
jlee@folgerlevin.com
mjonas@folgerlevin.com

Attorneys for Defendant Lyft, Inc.

s/ Jeremiah Frei-Pearson
Jeremiah Frei-Pearson

VERIFICATION

I, HARRIET LOWELL, have read the foregoing Responses and Objections to Defendant Lyft, Inc.'s Second Set of Interrogatories, know the contents thereof, and do swear that they are true and correct to my knowledge, information, and belief.

Dated: July 16, 2021

HARRIET LOWELL